



I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THIS CORRESPONDENCE IS BEING DEPOSITED WITH THE UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE AS FIRST CLASS MAIL IN AN ENVELOPE ADDRESSED TO: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS, P.O. BOX 1450, ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1450, ON THE DATE INDICATED BELOW.

BY:

Dana Marks

Date:

11/1/04

MAIL STOP ISSUE FEE

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In Re Patent Application of:	:	Allowed: September 2, 2004
Kiyoshi Taguchi et al.	:	
Conf. No.:	:	Group Art Unit: 1754
Appln. No.:	:	Examiner: Wayne A. Langel
Filing Date:	:	Attorney Docket No.: 10059-350
	:	(P22607-01)
Title:	:	HYDROGEN REFINEMENT APPARATUS

COMMENTS ON EXAMINER'S STATEMENT OF REASONS FOR ALLOWANCE

This is in response to the Examiner's Statement of Reasons for Allowance at page 3 of the Notice of Allowability attached to the Notice of Allowance of September 2, 2004.

This Comment is being filed to correct and clarify the record.

In the Office Action dated May 29, 2003, The Examiner also rejected claims 7-9 under §103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 5,030,440 of Lywood, et al. ("Lywood") in view of either U.S. Patent 6,110,862 of Chen, et al. ("Chen") or U.S. Patent No. 6,103,660 of Yperene, et al. ("Yperene"). The Examiner further rejected claims 7-9 as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 3,872,025 of Singleton in view of either Chen or Yperene. Applicants addressed these rejections in the Amendment filed on August 13, 2003 as follows:

-- Applicants have amended claim 7 such that claim 7 now recites, in part, that the shifting catalyst body comprises a carrier composed of at least one metal oxide selected from the group consisting of Ce, Zr and Ti, having a BET specific

surface area of at least 10 m²/g and Pt supported thereon. Support for this amendment is found in original claims 3 and 4 and in the specification at, for example, page 5, lines 12-15. Therefore, no new matter has been added, and entry of the amendment is respectfully requested.

As stated in the April 15, 2003 Amendment, the cited prior art references do not teach, suggest, provide a motivation for, or a reasonable expectation of success from such a catalyst body. Thus, in consideration of the amendment to claim 7 and Applicants' earlier arguments in support of claim 7, the method of the invention, as now recited in claim 7, is not obvious in view of the cited prior art references. It follows that, since claims 8-9 and 15 all depend directly from claim 7, claims 8-9 and 15 are also not obvious in view of the cited prior art references. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the Examiner's rejection of claims 7-9 are respectfully requested. --

Since the Examiner's Statement of Reasons for Allowance only addressed one of the grounds for rejection of claims 7-9, the Statement should also have indicated that claims 7-9 are allowable for the above additional reasons advanced by Applicants.

Respectfully submitted,

November 1, 2004
(Date)

By:

William W. Schwarze

WILLIAM W. SCHWARZE

Registration No. 25,918

AKIN GUMP STRAUSS HAUER & FELD LLP

One Commerce Square

2005 Market Street, Suite 2200

Philadelphia, PA 19103-7013

Telephone: 215-965-1200

Direct Dial: 215-965-1270

Facsimile: 215-965-1210

E-Mail: wschwarze@akingump.com